IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PIUS C.KURIAKOSE

WEDNESDAY, THE 10TH OCTOBER 2007 / 18TH ASWINA 1929

RP.No. 972 of 2007(N)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.8532/2007 Dated 14/03/2007

.....

PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN THE WRIT PETITION

JOSE, S/O.THOMMAN,
PUNNELIPARAMBIL HOUSE,
KOMBIDINJAN MAKAL PO THAZHEKAD,
THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.G.SREEKUMAR (CHELUR)

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS

---

1. THE ALOOR GRAMA PANCHAYATH,
KALLETTUMKARA P.O., REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
KALLETTUMKARA P.O., THRISSUR DISTRICT.

2. THE TRIBUNAL FOR LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT
INSTITUTIONS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE STATE OF KERALA,
REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT,
LOCAL SELF ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

R3 BY GOVT. PLEADER MR.K.J.MOHAMMED ANZAR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

PIUS C. KURIAKOSE,J.

- -

R.P.No.972 of 2007 in
W.P.(C) No.8532 of 2007

- -

Dated: 10th October, 2007

ORDER

The petitioner seeks review of my judgment dated 14.3.2007 by which I directed the Panchayat to keep Ext.P2 order of the Panchayat in abeyance for a period of one month. When a submission was made at the Bar that the petitioner sincerely intends to close down the piggery and what he needs is just three months time for that, I observed that it will be open to the petitioner to file a representation to the Panchayat in that line and if the petitioner files such a representation, the Panchayat will consider the same and pass appropriate orders. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had second thoughts and he has now made all arrangements for conducting the piggery unit which will not cause any room for any pollution or nuisance or inconvenience to the neighbouring public. The judgment, the petitioner requests, may not stand in the way of the Panchayat entertaining fresh application submitted by the petitioner for licence for conducting the piggery unit. I dispose of the Review Petition making an observation that the judgment sought to be reviewed need not stand in the way of the

Panchayat entertaining fresh application for licence submitted by the petitioner in accordance with law. At the same time, I make it clear that the above observation will not be misunderstood as a reflection regarding the merits of the petitioner's claim to have a fresh licence.

srd **PIUS C.KURIAKOSE, JUDGE**